

REMARKS

I. INTRODUCTION

Claim 1 has been amended. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-6 remain pending in the present application. In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the pending claims are allowable.

II. CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 112

In the Final Office Action, claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the recited limitation “the basic cross-sectional area.” (See 3/17/08 Office Action, p. 2.) Claim 1, as currently amended, replaces the limitation “a basic cross-sectional area” with the limitation “a uniform cross-sectional area.” The Specification provides support for the amended limitation. (See Specification, ¶ [0021]; Fig. 2.) Therefore, the Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112 should be withdrawn.

III. CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

In the Final Office Action, claims 1, 2, 4 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by International Publication WO 01/39937 to Santhagens Van Eibergen et al. (hereinafter “Eibergen”). (See 3/17/08 Office Action, pp. 2-3.) This rejection was maintained in the Advisory Action. (See 5/28/08 Advisory Action, pp. 1-2.)

Claim 1, as amended, recites “[a] shaving head comprising at least two blade-shaped cutting members each having a straight cutting edge extending parallel to a longitudinal direction of the shaving head, each cutting member being supported in a cartridge of the shaving head by a supporting member supporting the respective cutting member in a supported area on the

respective cutting member, said supported area extending over a predetermined distance perpendicular to the longitudinal direction, and each supporting member having a first portion in contact with said supported area remote from the cutting edge of the respective cutting member and a second portion in contact with said supported area near the cutting edge of the respective cutting member, *said first portion having a uniform cross-sectional area*, seen perpendicularly to the longitudinal direction, and said second portion having a reduced cross-sectional area compared to the uniform cross-sectional area of the first portion, wherein the second portion of the supporting member of at least one of the cutting members extends over at least half of said predetermined distance.”

Claim 1 has been amended to recite that the first portion of the supporting members that is remote from the cutting edge and has a “uniform cross-sectional area.” In contrast, Eibergen describes a shaving head including supporting members with a first portion that is remote from the cutting edge and has a variable cross-sectional area. (See Eibergen, Fig. 2.) The Applicants note that the “first portion” of the shaving head of Eibergen, as used here, is the same as the first portion as defined by the Examiner in the modified version of Fig. 2 of Eibergen provided in the Final Office Action. (See 3/17/08 Office Action, p. 3.) Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that Eibergen fails to disclose “said first portion having a uniform cross-sectional area,” as recited in claim 1. Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn. Because claims 2, 4 and 6 depend from, and, therefore, include all of the limitations of claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are also allowable for at least the same reasons.

IV. CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Final Office Action, claims 3 and 5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Eibergen as applied to claim 1 above, in view of U.S. Patent 5,822,862 to Ferraro (hereinafter “Ferraro”). (See 3/17/08 Office Action, pp. 3-4.) This rejection was sustained in the Advisory Action. (See 5/28/08 Advisory Action, p. 2.)

Ferraro does not disclose a supporting member with a first portion and a second portion as recited in claim 1, and thus fails to cure the deficiencies of Eibergen described above with reference to claim 1. Because claims 3 and 5 depend from, and, therefore, include all of the limitations of claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are also allowable.

CONCLUSION

It is therefore respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable. All issues raised by the Examiner having been addressed, an early and favorable action on the merits is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 7, 2008

By: 

Michael J. Marcini (Reg. No. 48,198)

Fay Kaplun & Marcini, LLP
150 Broadway, Suite 702
New York, New York 10038
Tel.: (212) 619-6000
Fax: (212) 619-0276